

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter. I thought there was something called a "Fairness" doctrine which would mandate that the media would have to air a recorded response, allowing the same amount of time. This so called documentary is actually a commercial. I suggest they be forced to air Michael Moore's documentary - Fahrenheit 9/11. The media has refused to show it on television because they see it as a commercial... what makes Sinclair's "documentary" any different?

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.